1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
10	CARLOS WILLIAMS,	CASE NO. C21-5536 MJP
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL DKT. NO. 262
12	v.	
13	LORI LAWSON, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Carlos Williams' Motion to Compel	
17	Admissions. (Dkt. No. 262.) Having reviewed the Motion, the Opposition (Dkt. No. 277), and all	
18	supporting materials, the Court DENIES the Motion.	
19	As best the Court can discern, Williams asks	s the Court to compel answers to his Fourth
20	Set of Interrogatories. (See Declaration of Carlos Williams ¶ 1 (Dkt. No. 263).) Williams appears	
21	to argue that he served these interrogatories on February 7, 2024, and after being told by	
22	Defendants' counsel she did not receive them, he re-served them on March 13, 2024 by sending	
23	them in the mail. (<u>Id.</u> ¶¶ 2-4.) Williams reasons that a response was due within thirty days of	
24		

1	service and that he had not received a response by April 18, 2024. (Id. ¶¶ 5-6.) As Defendants'	
2	counsel avers, her office received a copy of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories on March 18, 2024,	
3	and Defendants then provided a response on April 18, 2024. (Declaration of Michelle Hansen ¶	
4	5.) Applying Rule 6(d), the responses here were due by April 15, 2024—thirty days, plus three	
5	additional days from the date of mailing. Even though Defendants' responses were tardy, the	
6	Court finds no further relief can be granted because Defendants provided their responses—albeit	
7	three days late. Because Williams does not appear to seek any additional relief, the Court	
8	DENIES the Motion as MOOT.	
9	The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Plaintiff and all counsel.	
10	Dated May 31, 2024.	
11	Maesley Helens	
12	Marsha J. Pechman United States Senior District Judge	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		